

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 1-19 have been amended. Claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

### REJECTION under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as lacking utility. Claims 1-15 have been amended to recite “searching a predetermined document group according to a first search condition specified by a user to extract data of a plurality of documents from a storage that stores said predetermined document group.” The amendment clarifying that data is inputted from a plurality of documents of storage. Support for the amendment found on page 6 lines 14-18.

Claims 16 and 17 have been amended to read a “computer readable medium storing instructions to control a processor to perform a method comprising.”

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### REJECTION under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1, 16 and 18 have been amended to delete the phrase “directly or indirectly.” Removing language which the Examiner found vague. Claims 1, 16 and 18 further amended to recite “transforming said data of said plurality of documents into information to indicate said data of said plurality of documents to said user in a first display form and to enable said user to select a display item to be utilized as a second search condition in a following processing, and outputting the transformed information.” Support for the amendment found on page 14, lines 15-25 in the specification.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite “a form showing used words in said extracted documents and segments representing a degree of relevancy among said used words.” The use of the word segments replacing “connection lines.” It being well known in the art that segments and connections lines have the same meaning.

Claim 3 has been amended to recite “dividing said plurality of documents into clusters by using said data of said plurality of documents.” The amendment clarify which documents the claim language refers. Support for the amendment found page 10, lines 27-30 of the disclosure. Claim 3 further modified to recite, “extracting second data to be displayed from said data of said

plurality of documents, wherein a type of the extracted second data is predefined for said first display form.” Support for the amendment found on page 12, lines 8-12 of the disclosure.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite “wherein a type of said data item is predefined for said first display form.” Support for the amendment found on page 15, lines 14-17 of the amendment.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite “wherein said document group and said used word are to be utilized as said second search condition in said following processing.” Support for the amendment found on page 25 lines 7-22 of the disclosure.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

## **SUMMARY**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 26, 2006

By: /James J. Livingston/  
James J. Livingston  
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501